

---

Vol. XVI No. 4

---

Summer 1994

---

---

Creation

---

Social Science

---

and Humanities

---

QUARTERLY

---



# CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

**Voting membership** is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs, substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. Statement of Belief. Sustaining membership dues are \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$15 (foreign, \$20 U.S.) per year.

**Officers:** Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

**Editor:** Dr. Paul D. Ackerman.

**Board of Reference:** Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

ISSN 0740-3399



# EDITORIAL

## THE LAST ISSUE OF *CSSHQ*

With this last issue of *CSSHQ* we complete 16 years of publishing. Over those years the Lord has opened many doors of ministry for those of us associated with the Quarterly's publication. For my part, I have been particularly blessed in learning how to articulate and defend the biblical creation perspective on the university campus where I teach. In the past two weeks, for example, I have had occasion to dialogue with a new age proponent who came to campus. He stood in the center of campus holding a sign listing nine propositions regarding his views of the ultimate meaning in life and how the world might be saved from destruction and misery. I was curious about his activities and so I approached. His offer was that anyone who would listen and understand his nine points could, in return, present an alternative list of points. I listened to his points and then returned a couple of days later to present my counterpoints, the Christian gospel. The dialogue led into a number of penetrating questions by the man regarding the biblical creationist worldview. As I answered his questions, I became aware anew of how the work with *CSSHQ* had prepared me to present the gospel in the face of the questions and challenges that arise on the modern university campus. I thank God for the blessing of having been a part of this wonderful ministry and look forward to the next assignment / adventure with the Lord. I thank all of you *CSSH* readers for your prayers and support over the years. May God richly bless you all.

Paul D. Ackerman

# THE "MIRACLE" WE MISSED

*Edward Coleson*

According to Larry Burkett and many other pessimists, our nation is on the brink of bankruptcy. To those of us with a mature recollection of the Great Depression of the 1930s, that is a frightening prospect. If one remembers also what has happened to other countries in times of crisis, it is doubly so. This is an old problem, however; the Greeks<sup>1</sup> noted long ago that when the city-states became democracies the voters demanded so much of their governments that they became insolvent. In the ensuing confusion a tyrant took over and they lost their freedom. There have been enough modern examples of that tendency to indicate that their observation was correct.

Nor are "we, the people," the only ones who can bankrupt a nation. Spain "struck it rich" after 1492, but Carlos and Felipe II, the grandson and great-grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella, managed to squander it all. James A. Michener<sup>2</sup> even suggests that perhaps the mother of Carlos, Juana "la Loca" (the Mad), might have managed the affairs of Spain more wisely than her brilliant son in spite of her presumed insanity. That is a sobering thought. Of great interest also is the fact, briefly mentioned by Michener,<sup>3</sup> that scholars at the University of Salamanca knew perfectly well that Carlos was doing everything wrong and tried to tell him, but he wouldn't listen. Carlos and his son flunked their economics and Spain and her colonies have suffered ever since.

The Spanish monarchs were not the only ones to bankrupt their countries. To take another example, the later kings of France did the same thing. Louis XIV reigned long and lavishly; when he died in 1715, France was broke but managed to cripple along almost to the end of the century. In 1789 the day of reckoning came (the French Revolution). Like Carlos of Spain, the kings had scholars close to the throne who tried to bring order out of chaos and avoid catastrophe,<sup>4</sup> but they were not listened to either. In both countries an incredibly complicated system of regulations and controls stifled the economy and impoverished the people.<sup>5</sup> Of course, the powerful, rich, but blind aristocrats could not see that they better help get their national house in order for their own survival. Louis XV is said to have remarked: "Let the good machine run itself; it will last our time. After us the deluge." In 1789 the flood came.

What Spanish and French would-be reformers were trying to tell their rulers was that the economy would run by itself much better than the government was doing it, if they would reduce the legal code to what was called the "Natural Moral Law." To take one example, if I were a farmer, as my ancestors were, I should be able to raise any amount of any legitimate crop on my own land and market it in any



honest way without getting anyone's permission. This principle, applied to the entire economy, was what Adam Smith<sup>6</sup> called "the obvious and simple system of natural liberty." It should be noted that Smith was no anarchist; he was just saying that if we all did "right" (in the ethical sense of that word), our problems would begin to find solutions. He was not, as many people believe, trying to promote the interests of big business; he trusted no one - businessmen, bureaucrats, or tradesmen - as is obvious to anyone who has read his *Wealth of Nations*. He published his ponderous tome in 1776, the year of Thomas Jefferson's "Declaration of Independence." Both have the same theme - freedom.

What happened after the great book was published? In so far as national policy was concerned not much change took place for many decades. In fact, with the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars following soon after, there were twenty-six years of chaos and conflict (189-1815) before peace returned to Europe. As the war wound down, a terrible depression hit England and, of course Europe had been devastated, so things got worse before they got better. Since the landlords<sup>7</sup> who ran England were ruined by the depression, they tried to restore their own prosperity by keeping out foreign grain. These so-called "Corn Laws" made bad matters worse for ordinary people who were suffering more than the aristocrats. This was a period of history when many Englishmen took their Bibles very seriously and people were seeking to reform society. They had just abolished slavery in the British colonies and, like Alexander, they were looking for ways in which they might make additional "conquests." Needless to say, this practice of keeping working people hungry so the landlords could prosper came under bitter attack. Smith's "obvious and simple system of natural liberty" seemed to be the solution. As everyone knew, there was no shortage of food; with the opening of the West in America and an impressive list of inventions in agriculture and transportation, grain could be produced in abundance and brought to market. But the landlords permitted only a little of it to enter the British Isles. Adam Smith might be all right in theory, but they were not interested in trying his ideas in practice. In the meantime there was widespread hunger - needless hunger, too.

In this time of crisis, Christians went on the offensive and organized a society, the so-called "Anti-Corn Law League,"<sup>8</sup> which covered the country with their educational material ("propaganda," according to their enemies). They used their Bibles as much as economics books and trade statistics. Of course, others joined them, but the leadership and approach of the campaign was definitely Christian. But the landlords didn't budge. Then the crisis became a catastrophe. In 1845 heavy fall rains and potato blight destroyed the crop in Ireland<sup>9</sup> and soon the people were starving. Keeping out cheap grain from America and elsewhere was now indefensible. England went free trade in food and later in almost everything else. This policy was to serve them well during the Victorian era when the British invested heavily around the world and promoted economic development in many lands. But we should remember that the English knew what to do when disaster struck, because the Christian community had edu-



cated the nation in sound principles before it happened.

Now let us look at what our nation did in our time of crisis after the "Crash of '29." As one writer<sup>10</sup> remarked, in the mid-1920s we Americans were quite pleased with ourselves; we had recently won "The war to end all wars" by making "the world safe for democracy." We were then rapidly winning the battle in what was later called "The War on Poverty." Then in October of 1929 the economy and our dreams came crashing down to earth. The Republicans were in power then and had been during the period of prosperity. They now sought to restore our "Paradise Lost" by excluding imports; we would make everything we needed ourselves which should provide everyone a job at high wages. The economists in our universities protested as did foreign governments, but nobody paid any attention to them.<sup>11</sup> The "trade war" which followed intensified the depression, since we found we could no longer find markets for our staple exports such as agricultural products, since other nations retaliated. Worse still, this economic autarky was an important cause of World War II, because some countries could hardly feed their people without access to the markets of the world.<sup>12</sup>

It seems to be a truism that the party in power when depression comes in America will be voted out at the next election. In November of 1932 we elected Franklin D. Roosevelt. The economists of our universities sent the president-elect a letter telling him how to restore prosperity; they also published it in the papers.<sup>13</sup> They did this before he took office too. It was a simple two-point program and he had to do only one thing; they said to stay on gold and open our markets to the world. The economists believed recovery would start at once as foreigners started buying our "surplus"; the president chose to plow it under and he paid the farmers to grow less, while our neighbors across the world were going on short rations. We then started down the road to national bankruptcy. Have we now arrived at the brink more than sixty years later?

What proof can one give that a free-trade policy in the spring of 1933 would have brought rather rapid recovery? "Exhibit A"<sup>14</sup> is the German "Economic Miracle" after World War II. In the spring of 1945 Germany collapsed. The victors divided up the country and we got our share too. The American commander, General Lucius Clay, decided he needed an economic adviser, but finding a non-Nazi made the search somewhat more difficult. However, Ludwig Erhard was found and given the task of rebuilding Germany's shattered economy. The people were poor beyond our ability to imagine for the country's industries had been bombed to rubble. The little that was available was rationed. In 1948 the military government decided to issue a new currency, since American cigarettes had become a medium of exchange for the want of anything better. Dr. Erhard also had a reform of his own to institute, although he had not gotten permission to do it; he simply went on the radio and announced to the nation that controls and rationing were being abolished. Many Americans and Germans were angry, but the general decided to give it a try. In an amazingly short time the world learned of the "Wirtschaftswunder"<sup>15</sup> (the economic miracle). Could we not have had an even more spectacular

ECONOMIC MIRACLE in the spring and summer of 1933 here in America? As it was the second World War got our economy going again, but we had to wait until after Pearl Harbor in 1941 for this to happen. And think of the terrible cost "in blood, sweat and tears" of that conflict plus a mountain of debt which is still with us. Let us not despair. If Germany could rise like the mythical Phoenix from the ashes of a burned-out nation, surely there is hope for us if we can learn from our blunders and get back to sound principles. In the words of our Lord: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:32)

<sup>1</sup>C. Northcote Parkinson, *The Evolution of Political Thought*, p. 24.

<sup>2</sup>James A. Michener, *Iberia*, p. 514.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 34 and 35. See also Murray N. Rothbard, "Late Medieval Origins of Free Market Economic Thought," *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* (Summer, 1975), pp. 62-75.

<sup>4</sup>Robert L. Heilbroner, *The Worldly Philosophers*, pp. 44-45.

<sup>5</sup>John Chamberlain, *The Roots of Capitalism*, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup>Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, p. 651.

<sup>7</sup>G. F. Warren and F. A. Pearson, *The Agricultural Situation*, pp. 242-244.

<sup>8</sup>Asa Briggs, *Victorian People*, pp. 202-211.

<sup>9</sup>Dean Russell, *Frederic Bastiat: Ideas and Influence*, p. 75.

<sup>10</sup>J. Russell Smith and M. Ogden Phillips, *North America*, p. iii.

<sup>11</sup>Paul A. Samuelson, *Economics*, pp. 698-700.

<sup>12</sup>Glenn T. Trewartha, *A Geography of Japan*, pp. 141 and 323.

<sup>13</sup>Benjamin M. Anderson, *Economics and the Public Welfare*, pp. 302-304.

<sup>14</sup>Bruce Bartlett, "Ludwig Erhard and the German Economic 'Miracle,'" *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* (Summer, 1980), pp. 72-77.

<sup>15</sup>John J. Putman, "West Germany: Continuing Miracle," *National Geographic* (August, 1977), pp. 149-181.



# WILD TURKEYS AND THE CREATION MANDATE

*Eve Lewis Perera*

Our house in the Massachusetts Berkshires is at the base of a wooded hill. In the last few years we have been receiving visits from the wild turkeys that live somewhere in the forest above us. They have shining dark blue-gray feathers on their backs, shading to iridescent bronze on their necks. Their wing feathers are barred in brown and white, and beneath these are secondary wings in black with small white markings. The four tom turkeys, which come most often, sometimes fan their tails in a beautiful display, intensifying the impression by flapping their wings loudly. Their heads and necks are mostly bald with a bluish skin and red wattles. The hens have well-feathered necks and a longer, slimmer silhouette.

We are greatly moved at the sight of these birds, and house guests can scarcely believe their eyes. We were told that the turkeys had been re-naturalized, and the more I thought about it the more it reminded me of the creation mandate to Adam and Eve, continued by Noah. God told Adam and Eve to "have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth" (Genesis 1:28b).<sup>1</sup> The reason He had put the man Adam into the garden of Eden was "to tend it and keep it" (2:15). Adam's authority over the animals was such that whatever he called each creature, that was its name (2:19).

The first pair brought sin into the world, and as it increased greatly, God prepared to send the flood. At that time he renewed the Creation mandate with Noah, commanding him to take with him seven pairs of every clean animal and of flying birds, and two pairs of every unclean animal, "to keep the species alive on all the face of the earth" (Genesis 7:3b). The animals evidently trusted Noah: "... and they went into the ark to Noah, two by two, of all flesh in which is the breath of life" (7:15). God cared for the animals as well as for Noah and his family. When the rain ceased, "Then God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the animals that were with him in the ark" (8:1). The Lord who is there even when a sparrow falls (Matthew 10:29) values the lives of the animals He has made, and has given man the responsibility for their care and even for their survival.

Thus, whether they knew it or not, the people who made it possible for wild turkeys to live in New England were obeying a mandate from God that has been in existence from the beginning. The early colonists found wild turkeys everywhere, and they greatly admired them. In 1784, Benjamin Franklin wrote:

I wish the Bald Eagle had not been chosen as the Representative of our country; he is a Bird of bad moral Char-



acter; like those among Men who live by Sharping and Robbing, he is generally poor, and often very lousy. The Turkey is a much more respectable Bird, and withal a true native of America.<sup>2</sup>

The last wild turkeys in Massachusetts were gone by 1851, and by 1900 the bird was practically extinct. The use of firearms, coupled with the destruction of their forest habitat for fields and home sites, made the turkeys candidates for rapid oblivion. Unlike passenger pigeons, however, the wild turkeys had some alert defenders. States passed laws to restrict hunting, and special preserves were set aside where they could live undisturbed. What is more, many of the forests, at least here in New England, have grown back since the nineteenth century era when wood was the main source of heat and power.

In an effort to re-establish the birds, game managers tried to release farm-raised birds, a cross between wild and domestic turkeys. (Some South American turkeys had long ago been taken to Europe, where a domesticated breed was developed from them. The settlers had brought some of these to the New World.) Their passivity, which made them adaptable to living within fences, made them incapable of surviving in the wild. Unwary about predators and insufficiently resourceful in food gathering, most of them died. Then the game managers decided to net-trap groups of wild turkeys where they were still found, releasing them into good habitats in areas which lacked the birds. This was so successful that by now there are between one and a half and two million wild turkeys in the United States.<sup>3</sup> Since no one can do anything without the Lord's permission and enabling, it was He who gave people the perseverance and the wisdom to carry out this task.

The long, patient campaign to restore the birds seems like one of the finest examples of the modern-day exercise of man's creation mandate. Many people throughout history exercised this mandate, consciously or unconsciously in varying ways. One well-known example was Anna Sewall (1820-1878). Completely crippled some years after both of her ankles were broken in a fall, she wrote the classic children's book *Black Beauty* out of indignation at cruel treatment of horses. In her day, horses provided nearly all transport in England. They were neglected, beaten, poorly fed, and made to stand long hours in the sun or in extreme cold. Anna Sewall died shortly after her book was published. It had a decided effect for the better on the treatment of horses, besides delighting many generations of children with the sensitive story.

In Petersburg, New York, not very far from where we live, the Berkshire Bird Paradise receives and cares for wounded birds from all over the world, preparing them for return to the wild. If their injuries are too serious for that, they live permanently in pleasant enclosures, and visitors pay a small fee that helps to cover expenses. When I stopped there, intrigued by the name, the owner told me that he thought of the place as a kind of ark. Two bald eagles looking healthy and happy but unable to fly, had been long-time residents at the time of my visit. I suppose Benjamin Franklin might not have wanted to pay the entry fee to see them! One of them was photo-

graphed as the symbol of the US Postal Service.

Most people are aware of the massive reforestation in Israel, bringing back the beauty and fertility of the land and improving the water supply. Every year for the winter holiday Tu B'shevat, Jewish people send donations for the planting of more such trees. A huge forest, planted tree by tree, memorializes the six million who were killed in the Holocaust. Like all countries, Israel is hindered by sin as she carries out her creation mandate, but sometimes it seems that it is managed better there than almost anywhere else. One impressive project is called *Hai-Bar*, "to return the animals of the Bible to the land of the Bible."

Under the late Ottoman Empire, firearms did to the Biblical animals what they had done to the American wild turkey. The ostrich mentioned in Job (39:13) was blasted into extinction. So was Israel's native wild ass, possibly the kind Jesus rode on His entry into Jerusalem. A breed of Asiatic wild ass has been found, purchased from the Copenhagen Zoo, and slowly established in the country. Now living in the Negev, these animals are producing live-born foals, and their appearance is similar to that of the lost species. The Oryx antelope, thought by some to the "unicorn" referred to in the King James Bible (Job 39 and elsewhere), was almost extinct when a few animals were captured for breeding in zoos. Now many are naturalized in Israel. It may have been these animals, or some kind of mountain goat, that my husband and I saw leaping across a steep cliff in the En-Gedi Nature Reserve, near the caves where David had hidden from Saul. Israel has 280 nature reserves, covering more than one-fifth of her total land area.<sup>4</sup>

Stewardship is distorted when theology becomes unbiblical. Nowadays many people reject the Lord and are offended by His Creation plan that man is to have dominion over the creatures. Anyone who wears a fur coat, or even leather shoes or a leather belt, risks being berated by animal-rights activists (occasionally even physically attacked). It is called "species-ism" to suggest that human beings have any authority over animal life. While it is true that people did not wear clothing made from animal skins until after the Fall, nor eat meat until after the Flood, no New-Age edict can return us to innocence and sufficiency.

Unbelieving animal lovers notice correctly that animals do not engage in deliberate wrongdoing the way people do, suffering through no fault of their own the consequences of human wrongdoing. They do not know the Bible's explanation: "For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it in hope; because the creation itself also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Romans 8:20-21). Ignorant of the only true object of our worship, more and more people have "worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator" (Romans 1:25). Some dreamy theorists urge us to surrender our spirits to the earth itself, saying that it is holy, that it is a goddess called Gaia. They have declared a spring holiday, Earth Day, and many are trying to replace Christmas with a celebration of the Winter Solstice. Even those Christians who, like the Puritans, avoid cel-



celebrating Christmas must find this substitution offensive.

With the Bible cast aside, human reasoning nowadays takes us to some pretty extreme positions. An author named Linda Hasselstrom advises humans - as mammals - about their proper winter behavior: "eat, sleep and be hairy." This is meant to be amusing, but it is troubling. She says we eat lots of tasty desserts in the winter because that corresponds to the food foraging of our supposed animal ancestors. Her advice is to "curl up next to a warm furry body and sleep"; laying aside our razors, we should "grow enough fur to cover all that naked hide before it gets frostbitten."<sup>5</sup>

Although we do not see willed sin in the natural creation, we do see disorders caused by sin. For example, the winds, created as servants of man and of the creatures, are sometimes used by Satan and evil spirits to bring death and suffering. Apparently planning to drown Jesus and the disciples with a storm on the sea of Galilee, the enemies of our souls were thwarted when the Savior, awakened by His terrified friends, ordered the winds to be still (Matthew 8:23-27). Last spring we had a March snowstorm over four feet deep, and one of our neighbors found some dead turkeys in a hollow after the warm weather had arrived. The snow had been so wet and heavy they had been unable to climb out, he said. It was Adam's and Eve's sins brought that kind of disorder into the creation, harming all humans and the unsuspecting animals. But it is wrong to suggest that the animals' behavior carries an Edenic purity.

The wild turkeys act very pushy at feeding time. I had to buy them some cracked corn, sprinkling it on the kitchen steps, so they would leave a little bit of seed on the ground under our feeder for the larger songbirds. The biggest tom drove the other turkeys away, while the weakest got chased by all three of the others, no matter how hard he tried to find a safe feeding spot. Once, he approached the kitchen steps silently, hoping he would get some corn without being seen. Instead, he was sent packing with angry thrusts of his rival's beak. He tried giving a beak-jab and a kick in retaliation, but his bravado was not very convincing. As for the hen turkeys, only a few of them tried to get to the birdseed. The weakest tom might let them stay, but the others were relentless. The hens had to stay up on the hill, scratching beneath the snow for tree seeds and berries. When my mother told some of her neighbors about this male-female rivalry, they said, "Well isn't that typical!"

Even in successful restorations, careful responses to our creation mandate, there is a deep poignance. The bluebird has returned to Berkshire County, thanks to the Audubon Bluebird Project, whereby people with open pasture land are encouraged to place bluebird nesting boxes on poles in various places on their property. The bluebird had begun to die away when the old orchards, whose trees furnished wonderful nesting holes, were being cut down. (My husband and I saw the first bluebird of our lives when on a bike ride in 1993.) The sanctuary director, who showed slides of the bluebirds and their eggs for a luncheon group at my request, is delighted with the success of the project. "Still," he said, "I know that someday there will be a silent spring." Rachel Carson's book by that name, written in the

sixties, warned us that there would be a day when the songbirds could not live in our world any longer. She was not a prophet, nor even a believer, but it is true that nowadays the number and variety of songbirds is going down, and more crows, which sometimes kill small birds, invade their habitat.

Those sad realizations, along with the treatment of the hen turkeys by the toms, remind us that we live in a fallen, sin-filled world. It should be natural for the toms, which are larger, to protect the slender hens and make sure they get enough to eat. The fact that this does not happen - and that we notice with shock and outrage that it does not - only underlines more plainly that it *was* meant to be that way when the birds were designed, before sin distorted the world.

Heaven is full of praise to the Lord for His Creation:

You are worthy, O Lord,

To receive glory and honor and power;

For you created all things,

And by Your will they exist and are created.

(Revelation 4:11)

Chapter 8 of Revelation, when the seventh seal is broken, describes the pain of the natural world as God's judgment falls on sinful man. When the dread judgments, for which the angels and saints will praise our God, are completed, and heaven and earth are renewed, the wolf and the lamb will finally feed together (Isaiah 65:25). Then, perhaps, a big tom turkey will let all the females get to the seed ahead of him, and be glad of it.

Finish, then, Thy new creation; pure and spotless let us  
be;

Let us see Thy great salvation perfectly restored in Thee,  
Changed from Glory into glory, till in heaven we take our  
place,

Till we cast our crowns before Thee, lost in wonder, love,  
and praise.

Charles Wesley,  
*Love Divine, All Loves Excelling*

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>This and other Scripture quotations are from *The Holy Bible*, New King James Version (Thomas Nelson, Inc., Nashville, 1983).

<sup>2</sup>Benjamin Franklin, Letter to Sarah Bache, quoted in John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations* (Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1938), p. 228. The plural of "turkey" was "turkies."

<sup>3</sup>Dorothy Hinshaw Patent, *Wild Turkey, Tame Turkey* (Clarion Books, New York, 1989), pp. 19-22; David Stemple, *High Ridge Gobbler* (William Collins Publishers, Inc., New York and Cleveland, 1979), p. 47. The turkeys' position has become so secure that 26 states, including Massachusetts, allow brief hunting seasons for them.

<sup>4</sup>Insight Guides, *Israel* (APA Productions, Singapore, 1986), pp. 301-304.

<sup>5</sup>"Human Hibernation," *Dry Krik Review* reprinted in *Utne Reader*, as quoted in column by C.D. Nelsen, *Berkshire Eagle*, Pittsfield, MA, January 15, 1994.



# PLEKHANOV AND SOLOVYOV: A STUDY OF MATERIALIST AND IDEALIST MONISM FROM THE BIBLICAL CREATION PERSPECTIVE

*Ellen Myers*

The principal philosophical themes occupying European philosophical thought at the turn of the twentieth century are not only still with us today but have spread around the globe. They are materialist and idealist monism. Both view the world as one ("monist"), excluding the transcendent God and Creator of the Bible. Materialist monism, a modern movement which includes Marxists and secular humanists, asserts that in principle there is nothing but matter. Idealist monism, prominent today in the New Age movement but really a perennial strain of pantheistic thought surfacing over and over again from pagan antiquity till now, claims that in principle there is nothing but mind or spirit or "idea." In Russia in the 1890s two important philosophers represented these two branches of monism, the chief theoretician of Russian Marxism Georgi Plekhanov (1856-1918) and the mystical idealist Vladimir Solovyov (1853-1900). We will study their philosophies from the biblical creation perspective.

Both Plekhanov and Solovyov began to write and publish under Alexander III (tsar 1881-1894). Their thoughts found considerable support under Alexander III's ineffectual successor Nicholas II (tsar 1894-1917). Nicholas II's abdication in 1917 and murder in 1918 were, of course, largely due to the success of the revolutionary Marxism so ardently championed by Plekhanov. The influence of Solovyov was more subtle but widely disseminated among non-Marxist Russian religious thinkers before 1917, and later spread beyond Russia chiefly through the writings of the emigre philosopher Nikolai Berdiaev (1874-1948).

Plekhanov was known as the "Father of Russian Marxism." He founded the first Marxist organization in Russia and dominated the Russian Marxist movement for some twenty years. He was an important figure in the international socialist-communist movement as well. He taught that reality is nothing but matter in motion. It is subject to scientific laws which can account for any and all phenom-

ena in principle if not yet in actuality. Scientific, successful solutions to any conceivable problem may be confidently expected. This is the gist of Plekhanov's most influential book, significantly named *On the Development of the Monist View of History*. Lenin said that this book "had helped to educate a whole generation of Russian Marxists."<sup>1</sup> However, Lenin and Plekhanov gradually parted company. Communist historians neglected Plekhanov after 1924, as did the West.

Plekhanov coined the term "dialectic materialism" in 1891 in an essay on Hegel.<sup>2</sup> He became alienated from Lenin and the Bolsheviks because they insisted that, contrary to orthodox Marxist theory, a socialist-communist revolution was possible in Russia without first passing through an intermittent "second stage" of capitalist industrialization. He thought that the bourgeois middle class need not be totally excluded from participation in the revolution. He also understood that the overwhelming majority of the Russian people, the peasants, did not want nationalization of all property, especially the land. Already before 1917 he foresaw and feared the revolutionary leaders' turn to despotism by seizing power, imposing the revolution on the people from above as proposed by Lenin, and then retaining power indefinitely.<sup>3</sup>

During World War I Plekhanov departed from strict Marxist orthodoxy. He even came to accept the military defense of Russia against Germany on nationalist grounds. Perhaps his study of the social history of Russia had convinced him that nationalism also motivates human action, not only economics as Marx taught. Still more surprising, he now embraced the absolute ethics of Kant, which he had hitherto rejected on the Marxist materialist grounds that man's behavior is determined by his historical and economic circumstances and can therefore be neither absolute nor freely chosen.

Yet if no longer a solid Marxist, Plekhanov remained a monist to his dying day. Early in 1918 when, repudiated by the Communist Party, on his deathbed in the final stages of tuberculosis, alone and destitute, he comforted his wife with these words:

"And, then, what is death? A transformation of matter." And turning his glance toward the window, "Do you see that birch which leans tenderly against the pine? I, too, perhaps will one day be transformed into a similar birch. What is so bad about that?" ... On his gravestone, at his own request, appeared the words from Shelley's *Adonais*: "He is made one with nature."<sup>4</sup>

Plekhanov's "comfort" in the face of death was stated in terms of reincarnation reminiscent of Buddhism or Hinduism, branches of pantheist *idealist* monism. It included a bit of subjective anthropomorphism, the birch's "tenderness," unbecoming a strict materialist and unsubstantiated even from the idealist monist perspective. Plekhanov, much like popular New Age propagandists today, overlooked the possibility that he might be reincarnated as a spider or toad. And in what sense could birch, spider or toad still be *he*, Plekhanov? In the face of death monism in either its materialist or its idealist form offers no real comfort.

Actually there is no ultimate difference between materialist and



idealist monism, between pantheism and atheism, much as Plekhanov had earlier insisted there was (for instance, in his *Development of the Monist View of History*). He himself came to see that there were close parallels between modern Marxist materialism and the seventeenth century pantheist philosopher Baruch Spinoza. He

considered modern materialism to be closely affiliated to the outlook of Spinoza, agreeing with Feuerbach as to the nonessentiality of its theological component. "This Spinozism," he wrote, "freed from its theological lumber by Feuerbach, was the philosophy which Marx and Engels adopted when they broke away from idealism. ... the Spinozism of Marx and Engels was materialism in its most modern form."<sup>5</sup>

An attentive study of Spinoza's pantheist determinist system which explicitly equates "God" with "Nature" will confirm this judgment.<sup>6</sup> The direct link between monist idealist Hegelianism and monist materialist Marxism is even stronger evidence that monism is the root of which pantheist monist idealism and atheist monist materialism are but the branches, or the coin of which they are but the two sides.

A further fundamental link between materialist and idealist monism is their shared cosmology of evolutionism. This is so of necessity, for without biblical creation only evolutionism can account for the emergence of the present world. Thus Plekhanov found support for Marxism in the work of Darwin, Haeckel, Huxley and De Vries. Similarly, Solovyov also praised Darwin and uncritically accepted him.<sup>7</sup> In our own day the glaring scientific inadequacies of Darwinism have led both Marxist atheist materialist and New Age pantheist idealist monists to embrace the scientifically no less preposterous "punctuated equilibrium" evolutionist model instead.

Repelled by the reductionism of materialist monism, a not inconsiderable number of Russian thinkers of the 1890s turned to the mystic idealist monism formulated by Vladimir Solovyov. James H. Billington notes that

Solov'ev's conception of renovation was, in many respects, even more revolutionary and utopian than that of the Marxists. No less than the materialist Plekhanov, the idealist Solov'ev offered an absolute, monistic philosophy to the new generation. "Not only do I believe in everything supernatural," he wrote, "but strictly speaking I believe in nothing else."<sup>8</sup>

If Marx and Plekhanov were interested not so much in philosophical speculation but rather in changing the world, so was Solovyov: "The time has come not to run away from the world but to change it," he wrote to the woman he loved, unconsciously recapitulating Marx's well-known dictum on the task of the philosophers to change the world.<sup>9</sup>

Solovyov's philosophy began quite literally with a "vision," the vision of the supposed "divine feminine principle" in the Godhead:

At the age of nine he had the first of his visions ... the divine woman, whom he later called sophia, came to him

holding a flower in the midst of shining light and is typical of the occult mystical tradition which he did much to revive and make respectable in Russia. A second vision of sophia came to him in the British museum where ... he was studying Gnostic philosophy. He set off immediately for Egypt, where he had a third vision of sophia ... <sup>10</sup>

Solovyov shared his concept of a supposed "feminine principle" in the Godhead with the ancient gnostic philosophies he studied. In his lecture on "Godmanhood" he identified "sophia" with the quality of Christ as the Logos, defining her as "the idea which God had before him as Creator and which He realizes" in His creation. Man "is attracted ... to the quality of sophia in Christ himself."<sup>11</sup> He referred to the book of Proverbs as the supposed biblical justification of this concept.

All things existed for Solovyov in "all-unity" (*vseedinstvo*) with God. In a manner reminiscent of the pantheist idealist thought of G. F. W. Hegel, the emergent evolutionism of Henri Bergson (1859-1941), and of the whole ancient theosophic, gnostic occult tradition, he postulated that God Himself was seeking self-expression, and even self-realization, in and through His creation, and taught that "evolution is not through materialistic means but through creative spirit."<sup>12</sup> Man must strive for self-realization within this unity with God through "sophia," and also through his own creative experience. All this is thoroughly heretical from the biblical point of view. Elevating a supposed "feminine principle," reified as "sophia," to ontological inherence in the Godhead is idolatry.

Nevertheless, this aspect of Solovyov's thought led to a revival in Russian art. The search for a "spiritual" reality "behind" or "beyond" common everyday events or things in Russian Symbolist literature and Suprematist painting of the early twentieth century also had roots in Solovyov. In one important respect Russian art and literature of the time were wiser than Solovyov himself: they were preoccupied, as he was only at the very end of his life, with *evil* spiritual reality behind material reality, with decadence and with outright demonism. Thus some responsibility is his for the rise of interest in the diabolic, the demonic, and the morality-defying lifestyle of the period. Solovyov also declared in his book *The Meaning of Love* that his sexual ideal was androgyny (the union of male and female sexuality in one person, reflecting the "feminine principle" in the Godhead). This perennially recurring abnormal, occult concept was adopted after Solovyov's death by Dmitri Merezhkovsky and Zinaida Hippis, the main leaders in the search for a "new religious consciousness" in Russia in the early 1900s.

Solovyov profoundly desired the unity of all Christians. He praised Catholicism and the papacy, and also, inconsistently, Protestants and their exercise of liberty of conscience directly under God. However, he defined the church universal as an organized institution rather than the spiritual fellowship of individual believers. His ecumenical ideals were far removed from the actual state of divided Christendom at the time and thus impracticable. Nevertheless, and



despite his many grave philosophical departures from the biblical Christian faith, Solovyov exercised considerable influence upon a number of Russian thinkers who, after a pilgrimage through Marxism, returned to the Orthodox faith.

Much as Plekhanov forsook a number of ingredients of the materialist Marxist monism he had espoused in his earlier life, so Solovyov, too, came to a change of mind and heart. In fact, in the last years of his life he repented of and rejected his mystic idealist monism and returned to the Orthodox Christian faith. He abandoned his rosy optimism about a future theocracy guided by "sophia." One of his last works is a small book named *Three Conversations (Tri razgovora)*, which ends with his description of the future Antichrist. In an altogether admirable analysis of pre-revolutionary Russian religious thought in general, and of Solovyov's philosophy in particular, Georgii Florovsky points out that Solovyov repudiated

his "first metaphysic" - the gnostic mysticism and external theocratism closely linked with it of his early and middle years. ... in the "Povest ob Antikhriste" ("Tale of the Anti-Christ"), Solovyov places in the mouth of that "religious pretender," inspired by the spirit of evil, his own former intentions of an all-encompassing, reconciling, organizing synthesis, as the way of doing a great favor to humanity and overcoming forever all the evil suffering of universal life.<sup>13</sup>

Solovyov's "first metaphysic" was flawed from the start by gnostic notions opposing the biblical, transcendent, personal Creator. His mystical idealist monism denied that God, the Creator *ex nihilo* of all things, was ontologically different from the world, which he presented in the manner of ancient pantheism and the New Age movement today as one monistic whole in "all-unity" with God. Hence his answers to the problems of Russia at the turn of the century were falsely "spiritual," that is, without clear and concrete relevance. In this respect atheist materialist monism as promoted by the Marxist Plekhanov appeared - also falsely, as shown by the subsequent inhumanity, suffering, and economic bankruptcy brought about by victorious Communism - more oriented to actual reality.

The internal contradictions and insoluble problems of Marxism and historical determinism have been exhaustively discussed by numerous commentators. What has not been pointed out sufficiently, clearly and often enough is that it is impossible to arrive at any valid conclusions or truth about the world on the foundation of *monism*, whether in pantheist idealist or atheist materialist form. This is so because monism by definition includes man himself as part and parcel of the totality of all that exists. Therefore a consistent monist cannot claim to be standing outside and above the rest of the world (as the philosophic subject over against the philosophic object) to validly evaluate or even describe it from above or outside. The part cannot evaluate the whole.

This applies especially to history. It is already impossible, as historians know, to write history exactly "as it really was" (Ranke). How much more impossible it is, then, to validly delineate the alleged

"scientific laws" governing history as Marx and Plekhanov attempted to do. History is not a "science" in the empirical, testable, predictive sense. It is a record of human action, which in turn is the result of chance or impersonal determinism if monism be true and if there be no transcendent, sovereign, personal God Who created and sustains man and the world. If this personal God does not exist, the dead are not raised (for the monist's reincarnation is not personal resurrection), there is no human accountability, human action makes no difference in the last analysis, and we can only say with St. Paul, "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die" (1 Corinthians 15:32).

Only the transcendent, sovereign, personal God and Creator of all things out of nothing by His Word, and His revelation of Himself and His creation to man can make sense out of history and the world, and give meaning to human action. Only the transcendent, sovereign God and Creator can enable man to speak truly of this world, for only in this God can man borrow the required epistemological transcendence to evaluate it. In his famous *Socratic Memorabilia* Johann Georg Hamann, the great defender of the Christian faith in the eighteenth century, already stated that a philosophy like that of Socrates which antedates Christ and is unaware of Him can honestly do nothing in the service of truth but humbly admit its own ignorance, and he praised Socrates for saying, "I know that I know nothing." Would that philosophers today, postdating God's historical self-revelation in Christ, would humbly admit the bankruptcy of their atheist materialist or pantheist idealist monist premises and confess their ignorance together with Socrates in the service of truth. Would that they could go all the way with Solovyov in repentance, conversion and submission to God, the Creator and Lord of all.

<sup>1</sup>G. Plekhanov, *The Development of the Monist View of History* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956), Publisher's Foreword, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Samuel H. Baron, *Plekhanov* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1963), n. p. 287.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 354.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, n. p. 291.

<sup>6</sup>For an excellent, concise discussion of Spinoza's thought, see Frederick Copleston, S.J., *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 4 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co. Image Books, 1963), pp. 211-269.

<sup>7</sup>See Solovyov's article, "Beauty, Sexuality, Love" in Alexander Schmemmann, ed., *Ultimate Questions* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, [1965], 1977), pp. 73-134, especially pp. 80-86.

<sup>8</sup>James H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe* (New York: Random House Vintage Books, 1970), p. 465.

<sup>9</sup>M. Bohachevsky-Chomiak and B. G. Rosenthal, eds., *A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia, 1890-1918* (a collection of original articles by writers of the period), transl. by Marian Schwartz (Newtonville, MA: Oriental Research Partners, 1982), pp. 7-8.

<sup>10</sup>Billington, *The Icon and the Axe*, p. 465.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 467.

<sup>12</sup>Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 1220.

<sup>13</sup>From Florovsky's article, "In the World of Quests and Wanderings: The Passion of False Prophecy and Pseudo-Revelations," in Bohachevsky-Chomiak and Rosenthal, *A Revolution of the Spirit*, p. 244.



# THE BREAKDOWN OF PHILOSOPHY AND THE MODERN EVOLUTION-CREATION DEBATE

*Ellen Myers*

Biblical philosophy is "to think God's thoughts after Him" and agrees that "the fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom" (Proverbs 1:7). Its starting point for evaluating all things is God as CREATOR "of Whom, and through Whom, and to Whom are all things" (Romans 11:36). It strives to be faithful in all respects to God's infallible revelation of Himself in the Bible (Isaiah 8:20; Jeremiah 8:9). Non-biblical philosophy, on the other hand, is "to think on one's own," and its starting point is ultimately the self of each thinker.

Non-biblical philosophy always more or less denies the origin of the world by biblical creation *ex nihilo*. Hence its basic premises are monism, the idea that this present world is all there is, had no beginning and will last forever, and cosmic evolutionism, the idea that all that is evolved out of a primeval material or spiritual "One." Monism and cosmic evolutionism marked all philosophies of classical antiquity. They are also part and parcel of modern non-biblical philosophy in its obsolescent Darwinian as well as various cosmic evolutionist forms.

However, all non-biblical philosophies break down to the extent that they depart from the God/Creator of Scripture. Today we witness the breakdown of non-biblical philosophy right before our eyes. Having denied the Creator, it founders due to its own faulty premises. We will consider some of the most important aspects of the breakdown of non-biblical philosophy from the biblical creation perspective.

## PHILOSOPHY IN ANTIQUITY

The eminent philosopher and historian of science Stanley L. Jaki has thoroughly investigated the thought systems of the great civilizations of antiquity. They all shared a cosmology of an eternally self-existing, monistic, pantheistic and animistic universe everlastingly fluctuating between long periods of expansion and contraction, ascent and descent, birth and death. In such a universe man cannot produce lasting achievements because he believes himself tied to an ultimately meaningless treadmill in the great cosmic wheel of eternal recurrences. His highest wisdom consists in detachment from all

purpose and desire. Help and guidance from a deity beyond this world—the God of biblical creation *ex nihilo*—is ruled out. The “gods” of antiquity symbolized the forces of nature and were subject to it.

Jaki also shows that the ancients in India, China, Egypt, Babylonia and ancient Greece and the Aztecs, Incas and Mayas excelled in the observations of nature and the starry sky and in practically useful technical inventions. Upon a few occasions, most notably in ancient Greece, they also advanced in abstract thought, such as Euclidean geometry, and in specifically science-related theorizing. However, due to their monistic premises even their best thinkers such as Plato or Aristotle could not consistently do more than speculate on an ever shifting world as all there is. Today Hinduism best represents that ancient monistic world view, which is now rapidly spreading again in the West through the “New Age” movement.

Greek philosophy combined purely speculative thought with empirical observations. It is said to begin with the prediction of a solar eclipse in 585 B.C. by Thales. Besides doing astronomy Thales also sought to find unity in the multiplicity of observed data, the highest ambition of non-biblical philosophy. Thales presupposed a single elementary cosmic matter at the root of all transformations of nature. Greek philosophy never departed from the basic monism inherited from earlier thought. This was also true for Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). He believed in the eternity of the material universe. No armchair philosopher, he studied firsthand all the natural sciences known in his time. However, he considered all nature as one single organismic whole in the process of cyclical transformation. He was not a Darwinist evolutionist because he believed in the eternity and fixity of species determined by their eternal, inherent “forms,” a concept he took from Plato. However, he explicitly denied creation (*De Caelo, III*), and he taught (*Physics, VIII*) that matter and forms were co-extensive and co-eternal with God (pantheism). Much like the vitalist evolutionist philosophers of the nineteenth century A.D. Aristotle believed in an immanent teleology in natural processes. By these processes, he taught, nature’s “forms” strove to actualize themselves out of the eternal primary matter in which he like Thales anchored the essential oneness of all things.

It is of supreme importance to realize that, as Jaki points out, “If man [is] a tiny part of a huge cosmic animal, there remain[s] little if any psychological possibility that he could ever achieve a conceptual stance which would put him outside the whole for a critical look at it.” (1) Such a stance is not only psychologically unlikely but also logically false if nothing exists beyond this present world. Due to their monistic premises the Greek philosophers could only act “as if” it were possible for man to be a separate “subject” studying and making valid statements about the rest of reality as its “object.” However, only a cosmology which recognizes that there is a personal Being who is transcendent (apart from and above the universe), absolutely sovereign (he does not depend upon the world, but rather the world depends on him in all respects), who made man in his own image and likeness and gave him dominion over the rest of the world—that is, the cosmology of biblical creation and its God—allows man to reason



consistently as a "subject" investigating the world as an "object" as he in fact does. This point alone invalidates all non-biblical philosophies. Because of their non-biblical philosophies no great civilization except the Christian West developed modern science. As Jaki says: "The future of man rests with that judgement which holds the universe to be the handiwork of a Creator and Lawgiver. To this belief, science owes its very birth and life. Its future and mankind's future rest with the same faith." (2)

### **MODERN IDEALIST PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT**

Modern non-biblical evolutionist thinkers have often explicitly returned to the world view of antiquity. One of them was Pitirim A. Sorokin (1889-1968), chairman of the department of sociology at Harvard from 1930-1959. He stated that the roots of his philosophy were in "the ancient, powerful, and perennial stream of philosophical thought represented by Taoism, the Upanishads, and Bhagavad Gita ... shared by all branches of Buddhism, including the Zen Buddhist thinkers ... by Heraclitus and Plato ... reiterated by ... thinkers of the Neo-Platonic, the Hermetic, the Orphic, and other currents of thought." (3)

Sorokin's philosophy and the ancient pagan and "idealist" (roughly, Platonic) thought systems he embraced foreshadow the New Age movement today. The adherents of this movement deny biblical creation and see the world as one with "god." Its world view is monistic and pantheistic. It is evolutionistic, believing that the world always existed and evolved over eons of time under the guidance of cosmic spirits or forces. Because of its uncritical and haphazard mingling of many strands of earlier "idealist" thought, this movement shows the present breakdown of philosophy as a formal and systematic method of assessing reality. Among philosophers whose thought has affinity with this movement are Heraclitus (ca.525-475 B.C.), who taught that all things are always in flux; Plato (427?-347 B.C.); Plotinus (205-270 A.D.), the most important neoplatonist philosopher; Spinoza (1632-1677), whose pantheism equated God with nature; Rousseau (1712-1778), the philosophical father of the disastrous French Revolution and of modern "child-centered" education; Hegel (1770-1831), a pantheist from whom Marx inherited his "dialectical" formulation of social evolution; Nietzsche (1844-1900), greatly influenced by Darwinism and a modern disciple of Heraclitus; Bergson (1859-1941), who founded the "creative evolution" school of philosophy; his student Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955), a "cult hero" of today's New Age movement who taught that God evolves from matter, a process which will culminate in the transformation of matter into "pure spirit"; and modern existentialist thinkers like Sartre.

### **MODERN RATIONALIST OR MATERIALIST THOUGHT**

A study of the more "rationalist" or "materialist" philosophers from Aristotle to Dewey (1859-1952) who saddled America's public schools with his notorious "progressive education," shows that to the degree that they embrace monism and deny the Creator of the Bible

the differences between them and the "idealists" with regard to "god" (atheism vs. pantheism) are ultimately only a strife about words. For example, the generally rationalist philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is related to modern New Ageism because its idea that reality is defined by man's own perception can be traced to him. Vladimir Solovyov (1853-1900), Russia's greatest philosopher, taught a New Age-type world view of cosmic evolution permeated with Darwinism until shortly before his death when he repudiated his earlier views and returned to orthodox Christianity. There are basic similarities between Marx, the atheist-materialist, and Plotinus, the neoplatonist pantheist-idealist.(4) Georgii Plekhanov (1856-1918), the philosophical father of Russian Marxism, discovered with pleasure the essential kinship between modern Marxist materialism and the pantheism of Spinoza.(5) Dewey, a thoroughgoing materialist Darwinian evolutionist, was strongly influenced by Hegel, the pantheist. Monistic idealism and monistic materialism are but the branches of the same root, monism, which is the denial of biblical creation and its transcendent God. In the collapse of communism and Darwinism we see the breakdown of the materialist branch of that root today.

## THE PRACTICAL OUTWORKING OF NON-BIBLICAL MONISTIC PHILOSOPHY

Non-biblical philosophers have been at odds with each other about human action and most everything else since they began to "do philosophy." The Bible teaches us to "test all things; hold fast that which is good" (I Thessalonians 5:21). Non-biblical philosophy attempts to test all things, but it cannot "hold fast that which is good," for it has no evaluative standard by which it can determine or validate once and for all what shall count as "good." This problem is aggravated by philosophies of flux or change as all there is in this world, especially philosophies of modern evolutionism. In their world of continuous change any command to "hold fast that which is good" can at best serve only for short periods of time with minimal change and only in a relative, not an absolute sense. For nothing in a self-existent, self-contained evolutionist world of universal flux can possibly be "good" absolutely, once and for all—because in such a world nothing really is once and for all. Non-biblical philosophers cannot even make assertions of temporary, relative or probable "truth." To do so they would have to know first what absolute, certain "truth" is to begin with, as St. Augustine already pointed out fifteen hundred years ago in *Contra Academicos*. Because non-biblical philosophy has no absolute truth to begin with, it is bankrupt from the start.

Modern Darwinism in particular gives no reliable guidance for its practical outworking. Many mutually contradictory social theories lean upon Darwin for "scientific" support. For example, both laissez-faire individualist free market economists as well as socialists have claimed substantiation of their views in Darwin. Between about 1900 and World War I all political parties in every European country "invoked Spencer and Darwin,"(6) as did both imperialism and pacifism.(7)(8) Darwinism sired the despicable and deadly racism and eugenicism embraced by the Nazis who considered themselves the



most forthright enforcers of Darwinian evolutionism.(9) It also gave tremendous impetus to Marxism and Communism. These modern abominations which cost many millions of innocent human lives and untold torments and deprivations are the products of monistic philosophy in modern materialist dress. Monistic philosophy in its ancient pantheist-idealist forms also committed its bloody mass murders in Assyria, Babylonia, Canaan, Egypt, China, and under the Aztecs, Incas and Mayans.(10)(11) Hinduism and Buddhism, monist-pantheist to the core, keep millions in abject misery and degradation on a level with or lower than animals. All this is not surprising because only biblical creation teaches that man was created in the transcendent, personal Creator-God's own image and likeness and with dominion over the works of God's hands. Where the God of the Bible is denied, man too is trodden underfoot. The breakdown of non-biblical philosophy manifests itself perhaps most clearly in the misery, slavery and death of the men, women and children subjected to its practical outworking.

## **CONFLICT AND TRUTH IN MONIST-EVOLUTIONIST PHILOSOPHIES**

The brutality in the outworking of monist-evolutionist philosophies is no accident. Monist-evolutionist philosophies begin with conflict within the "One" ("god" or "primary matter") as the mechanism giving rise to the "Many" (the multitude and variety of observed phenomena). For the ancients the world was unceasing conflict as the essential, primordial "One" disintegrates into the "Many" only to return to its "Oneness" at the end of each cosmic evolutionist cycle. Eastern concepts of Karma and reincarnation, Nietzsche's "superman" evolving by struggle from lower mankind extrapolated directly from Darwinism, his belief in the "eternal recurrence" of all things, and the notion of an "oscillating universe" in physics today belong to this world view. Darwinian and "punctuated equilibrium" evolutionists see in conflict ("survival of the fittest," or catastrophes causing mega-mutations) the change agent leading evolution onward and upward. Marxism and Nazism, both closely related to Darwinian evolutionism as we have seen, were philosophies of brutal conflict ("class war" and "race war") as the means to usher in the future perfect society. Conflict in monist-evolutionist philosophies is hence not evil but rather the dynamic element indispensable to "progress." The Hegelian dialectical scheme of thesis-antithesis-synthesis which Marx took over as his own is a modern version of this ancient monist-evolutionist world view.

It is therefore no surprise that John Dewey, a consistent follower of Hegel and an ardent Darwinian evolutionist since his student days, introduced conflict within the very definition of "truth" itself. For him any statement purporting to be "truth" had to be tentative in view of possible future inquiry, and to contain "the confession of its own inaccuracy and onesidedness" as "an essential ingredient." (12) This means that according to Dewey "inaccuracy and one-sidedness" must of necessity forever inhere in, help formulate, and conflict with "truth;" earlier "truths" are forever in conflict with later "truths." Hence

Dewey's definition of "truth" really defines nothing and is contrary to the fundamental logical law of contradiction (that is, a term must mean at most a finite number of things). Christian philosopher Gordon Clark shows that Dewey's denial of the law of contradiction reduces his philosophy and by extension all philosophies of universal flux or evolutionism to nonsense.(13)

Dewey also condemned the traditional philosophical "spectator theory of knowledge" with its "subject-object" method. He argued that "knowing" and "doing" are the same thing, analogous to scientific experimentation where the "truth" of a theory is judged by its experimental results or consequences. The biblical thinker must point out that Dewey himself was guilty of the "subject-object" approach when presupposing a priori that monistic evolutionism is true. To reason at all, man must reason as though he himself stood apart from and above nature; his very mode of reasoning bears out the biblical creation account.

Till about the end of the eighteenth century A.D. Western philosophers reasoned by the "subject-object" method, though without reference to its epistemological foundation in biblical creation. They believed that human thought must conform to a really existing "given" reality. The tremendous change that began with Kant was that man's consciousness was increasingly seen as the final organizing principle of outer reality reduced to mere "phenomena" or "appearances." In man's mind, then, all things were unified and the self and the "not-self" coincided. This, of course, is consistent with non-biblical evolutionist monism. There is this difference, however: the ancients still saw themselves as subject to a world they had not made themselves, whereas the modern philosopher wants a world he himself creates by his own mind and will so he may transform and rule it; in biblical language, he wants to be God. Alternately the modern philosopher is not a philosopher in the Western traditional sense at all. He absorbs the world into his own consciousness. Thomas Molnar rightly states that this world view has led to an "increasing disarray of the philosophical enterprise ... insofar as the philosopher assumes the magician's role and manipulates the constitution of being, he liquidates the philosophic enterprise ..." (14) Molnar wants to restore knowledge "as a valid relationship between subject and object as separate entities," and in order to do so the human soul must realize "its creatureliness, its nonidentity with God." If no distinctions are set between the self and the not-self, "the subject is lost in self-contemplation, or, what amounts to the same, it stares ahead into nothingness." (15) Thus non-biblical philosophy, having rejected biblical creation, ends in its own self-destruction.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The fundamental premises of non-biblical philosophy are these. First, in its monistic world of which man is but a tiny part man cannot reason consistently about the world as though he stood outside and above it. Such a "subject-object" stance is consistent only with the biblical creation perspective seeing man as made in God the personal, transcendent Creator's own image and likeness and with dominion



over the works of God's hands. This point alone invalidates all philosophies not grounded in biblical creation. Second, the evolutionism presupposed in non-biblical philosophies robs them of all fixed reference points or absolutes from which to validate their views. Modern Darwinism in particular gives no reliable guidance for its practical outworking. Hence it led to mutually contradictory movements and finally to the horrors of Nazism, Communism, racism and eugenicism. Ancient monistic philosophies also resulted in mass murder, misery and death. Third, monistic non-biblical thought sees conflict not as evil but as the dynamic change agent indispensable to "progress" and "truth." Lastly, since Kant non-biblical thinkers increasingly attempt to be as gods by transforming and ruling a world they themselves create by their own minds and wills. This is the end stage of the breakdown of non-biblical philosophy, and it is before us today. Non-biblical philosophy first betrayed and has now abandoned the true purpose of philosophy, which is to interpret the world as it really is. Because the world is really the product of biblical creation, only a philosophy which fully accepts and reasons from biblical creation is sufficient for that purpose.

## REFERENCES

1. Jaki, Stanley L., *Science and Creation*. Science History Publications, New York, NY, 1974, p.20.
2. *ibid.*, viii.
3. Quoted in Myers, Ellen, "Sorokin's 'Integralism' vs. the Biblical Creation Position," *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, Wichita, Kansas, II:1, Fall 1979, p.14.
4. Lapkovski, Valeri, "Metastazy ekataza" ("The Metastases of Ecstasy"), Moscow, Soviet Union, *Byulleten' Khristianskoi Obshchestvennosti* (*The Bulletin of Christian Community*), 13:1989, pp.72-83.
5. Baron, Samuel L., *Plekhanov*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 1963, n.p.291.
6. Barzun, Jacques, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*. Doubleday Anchor Books Edition, Garden City, NY, 1958, p.94.
7. Bannister, Roger L., *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Thought*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA, 1979, pp.226-242.
8. Hofstadter, Richard, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*. The Beacon Press, Revised Edition, Boston, MA, 1955, pp.170-200.
9. Gasman, David, *The Scientific Origin of National Socialism*. The American Elsevier Publishing Co., New York, NY, 1971.
10. Shafarevich, Igor, *The Socialist Phenomenon*. Harper & Row Publishing Co., New York, NY, 1980.
11. DeParrie, Robert and Pride, Mary, *Ancient Empires of the New Age*. Crossway Books, Westchester, IL, 1989.
12. Quoted in Myers, Ellen, "Conflict-Action-Growth: An Appraisal of John Dewey from the Biblical Creation Perspective (Part 2)," Wichita, Kansas, *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, III:3, Spring 1981, p.15.
13. Clark, Gordon, *Dewey*. Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, PA, 1960, p.68.
14. Molnar, Thomas, *God and the Knowledge of Reality*. Basic Books, Inc., New York, NY, 1973, pp.201, 202.
15. *ibid.*, pp.141, 142.

**Note:** Reprinted from the *Proceeding of the Second International Conference on Creationism* (Vol. 1, 1990, pp 159-163) available through Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., 362 Ashland Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15228.

# LANGUAGE AND REALITY: THE WORK OF ARNAUD-ARON UPINSKY

*Ellen Myers*

**Arnaud-Aron Upinsky, *La tete  
coupee ou la parole coupee*  
(*The Head Cut Off or the Word Cut Off*).**

Paris: O.E.I.L., 27, rue de l'abbé Gregoire,  
Paris 6, France, 1991. Softcover, 576 pp., incl.  
Preface by Marcel Jullian, Bibliography. 230 F.

This unique book is astounding in scope, scholarship, and commitment to the position that truth really exists and that human language must truly express it. Its thesis is summed up on its back cover:

Since Plato, Machiavelli, Hobbes and Rousseau we have known that every theory of power is also a theory of *man*, a theory of *politics* and of *history*. With A.- A. Upinsky ... the entire history of mankind is seen as essentially the war without mercy between two mutually hostile languages: *realism* and *nominalism*. The *realists* are those who believe in the *truth* of words; the *nominalists*, those who believe in the *power* of words. ...

Today the nominalist thesis rules in the predatory language of the *political rhetoric* which constitutes the greatest intellectual mystification of all time. ... It is by cutting off the word that it causes heads to fall, by castrating knowledge that it makes the spirit powerless, by making itself *double language* that it maintains itself in power.

To expose this *perversion of language* in order to defeat the political language, to put language back on its feet has today become a matter of spiritual if not physical survival ...

Is it not liberty to have understood this?

Upinsky's work is hence not merely concerned with the use and abuse of language but also with the exercise of power, the foundation of knowledge, and the nature of man. His factual documentation reaches from the high middle ages to our own time but draws most heavily upon the brief, disastrous span of the French Revolution (1789-1793). Anyone ignorantly praising this event as liberating

CSSH Quarterly

Vol. XVI, No. 4 (Summer 1994)



mankind from the fetters of reactionary religious and political oppression will be shorn of this illusion. The old hierarchy of king, nobility and church was merely replaced by the new elite of lawyers and bureaucracy, still in power today in the name of "liberty, equality and fraternity." The "people" were never properly represented during the French Revolution as their vast majority, the peasantry, was not represented at all. Very quickly the radical Jacobins, actually only one-half of one percent of the people, claimed to speak for all during the reign of terror. Their leaders Robespierre and Saint-Just silenced and then killed all opposition in the name of revolutionary "virtue" till they themselves were silenced and beheaded in turn.

The Enlightenment philosophers' myth of the "noble savage," which denied the Biblical Christian teaching of the fall, original sin and hence man's need for Christ as Saviour from sin, and which rejected civilization, the fruit of Biblical teaching, as oppressing and corrupting man's mythical primitive goodness, paved the way for the French Revolution holocaust. Now bloody human sacrifices and cannibalism are ubiquitous marks of primitive societies as Upinsky shows in detail; and bloody human sacrifices by the guillotine in the name of "liberty" as well as actual cannibalism reappeared with the Revolution in France, the leader of European civilization only a generation before. As Ken Ham, a prominent spokesman of the international biblical creationist movement of our own time, frequently points out, without Christ it takes only *one* generation for people to fall from civilization back into barbarism. In the United States of America today we witness a similar resurgence of the "noble savage" myth in a flood of books and films such as *Dances with Wolves*, "politically correct" hostility during 1992 against Christopher Columbus, the bearer of Christ and Christian civilization to the Americas, and the whole "multicultural" approach to the teaching of history replacing courses in Western Civilization. At the same time, not by coincidence, murderous primitive gangs roam our streets, our children are not safe in our public schools, and, yes, blood sacrifices and cannibalism in the name of Satanism are multiplying. The "harvesting" of blood from prisoners about to be shot in Castro's Cuba, and of organs from aborted babies and accident victims who may still be alive is also a form of cannibalism.<sup>1</sup>

Upinsky shows how the French Revolution's struggle for raw power was initiated by changes in *language* from the realist to the nominalist mode, mirroring the growing philosophical and scientific preoccupation with the transitory details of the here and now rather than the supernatural eternal, everlasting truths of the good, the beautiful and the true at the summit of reality which are given to us by the transcendent, personal Creator. These eternal absolute values exist and must condition all life. The existence of the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" of Genesis shows that good and evil are not arbitrary. They exist outside of the good will of man. They are even the finality of being.

The realist theory of knowledge is hence that of innate ideas [of true reality]. God has *simultaneously* created the body and the spirit of man - as thing and

name - according to the same model. In gifting man with language, God has given him the indispensable foundational ideas to construct the others and to assure his wellbeing. Is not the idea of good and evil the first innate idea? the realist asks himself. (p. 191)

Realism is the enemy of modern abstract and atomizing individualism as it is the enemy of evolutionism:

The *biological* analogy is the key of realist incarnation. It is by this view that the realist concretely conceives the idea of the universal, the *idea of man*, how "several men are specifically one single man." He notes in effect that it is *kinds* - mankind, horsekind, lionkind, and so on - and not individual men, horses, lions etc., which God has created and which *reproduce themselves*. Man begets man but Peter cannot beget Peter! ...

For medieval man, the *general ideas* - the universals - are therefore in the image of the created kinds: realities independent of man which he could not create himself. ... it is the *quality* of the species which makes the individuals and not the *number* of the individuals which makes the quality of the species. A million sparrows will never again permit the recreation of one single couple of passenger pigeons: this species has disappeared forever, as have many others. And it is not the brilliant theory of evolution which will give it back to us. ...

From the reality of the kind the realist deduces the idea of the reality of the family which becomes his representative model of stability, of movement, of unity and of authority. (p. 192)

For Upinsky the origin of authority comes from God, "the Father of the Word," and even so the king must rule over his subjects as the father of a family, for all power proceeds from the power of the father. "Thus, for the realist," states Upinsky, "the entire question of the three origins - of language, of knowledge and of power - is deduced from one single principle: 'In the beginning was the Word.'" (p. 193)

The realist takes natural language as his model while the nominalist takes mathematical language as his ideal "in locking up the Word in words - in *labels* - and then the words in numbers." Nominalist language both inverts and copies realist language. For example, the realist "Genesis" becomes the nominalist "Geometry"; "Word" becomes "reason, name, number"; "supernatural" becomes "temporal"; "revelation" becomes "invention"; "salvation" becomes "happiness"; "reality" becomes "sensation"; "spirit" becomes "sense"; "incarnation" becomes "abstraction"; "good" becomes "pleasure"; "evil" becomes "pain"; and so on (p. 194-195).

For the nominalist "all qualitative principles of language must be subjected to the exterminating razor of the measurable. Henceforth, therefore, language is no longer a gift of the Word but the pure product of man's invention. It is no longer reality which makes the name but the name which makes reality, as in mathematics" (p. 196). By reducing the world created by the transcendent, personal God of

Genesis to the empirically measurable here and now, nominalism ultimately leads to a void without any truth or reality whatsoever. Upinsky is right: When the Word is cut off, the head, man himself, is cut off as well.

The nominalist "makes definitions which are useful rather than true," and therefore "only *fractions* of reality. ... Today, happiness is reduced to the *living standard*; justice to *equality*; fraternity to *social transfer payments*; the quality of life to *mathematical life expectancy*; opinion to *statistics*; politics to *electoral percentages*; prestige to *salary*, the people to a *majority*, etc." (p. 196) Upinsky's list comes from today's France, but it is just as valid wherever this perversion of language has spread. We can all enlarge it by falsification labels like "sexually active" for "promiscuous," "politically correct" for leftwing academic censorship, "fetal tissue" for preborn babies, and so on. The modern academic trend of "deconstructionism" is nominalistic to the core. Charles Colson writes that

Deconstruction is literally the dismantling of language, texts and discourse. It began in the realm of language and has since spread to other disciplines. ... If language, discourse, and thus, the intention of an author, can be called into question and doubted, then other realms can fall like dominoes. History, law, and politics proceed from an undermining of language, not vice versa.<sup>2</sup>

Upinsky is not the first modern thinker to reflect upon this deliberate falsification of language. Already in the 1940s C. S. Lewis pointed out that

The belief that we can invent "ideologies" at pleasure, and the consequent treatment of mankind as mere specimens, preparations, begins to affect our very language. Once we killed bad men: now we liquidate unsocial elements. Virtue has become *integration* and diligence *dynamism*, and boys likely to be worthy of a commission are "potential officer material." Most wonderful of all, the virtues of thrift and temperance, and even of ordinary intelligence, are *sales-resistance*.<sup>3</sup>

An astute observer of Nazism and Communism, George Orwell was well aware of the crucial importance of language perversion in the service of murderous tyranny. He appended a detailed description of "Newspeak," the language of the world-wide totalitarian government he saw in our imminent future, to his famous 1984. "Newspeak" is reductionist to the core and makes the very thought and expression of any and all finer variations of meaning impossible. The key Newspeak words "ungood" or "doubleplusungood" eliminate words like "bad," "wicked," or "despicable," and thus exclude all moral value judgments from language itself. Upinsky refers specifically to this perversion (pp. 365-366). 1984 also features a "Ministry of Love" or "Miniluv," the state headquarters for the torture and brainwashing of dissidents, and "Minitruth," the state department of propaganda where current events and history are continually rewritten to suit the government line of the moment, and where documentation of the true facts is consigned to the "memory hole" (incinerator).



Upinsky emphasizes the close connection between reductionist, arbitrary, abstraction-mongering "nominalist" language which murders true words, and power-mad elitist tyrants who reduce men created in God's own image and likeness to mere numbers in a "labor pool," a "work force," or "cannon fodder" which they can use and discard at will in the name of their hypocritical, pretended, media-touted "public safety" or "public welfare." This close connection was evident already when William of Occam (1285-1349), the brightest light of nominalist scholasticism, defined a word as neither a truth nor a reality but rather as a *force* (p.198). It was also evident to the great Christian thinker Johann Georg Hamann (1730-1788) who stood virtually alone in his uncompromising opposition to the Enlightenment philosophers, writing as a "realist" of the first order standing upon God's Word alone:

Your murderous lying (mordluegnerische) philosophy has eliminated nature ...

[We must] purify the natural use of the senses from the unnatural use of the abstractions by which our concepts of concrete things have been as mutilated as the name of the Creator is suppressed and blasphemed.<sup>4</sup>

Hamann also recognized the pernicious anti-Christian elements in his contemporary Immanuel Kant's concept of "pure reason," which was but another formulation of Plato's "pure idea" (*nous*). He wrote:

"Words as objects undetermined by empirical perceptions are named, according to the basic text of pure reason, aesthetical appearances: therefore ... words as objects undetermined by empirical perceptions are ... non- or anti-words ... " <sup>5</sup>

Upinsky shows that with regard to men's rights and duties the realist believes that there is an absolute law or standard of right and wrong, based upon God and creation, from which men's legislation should proceed. The nominalist, on the other hand, believes that men's legislation, that is, man himself, periodically makes the "law" of what shall count as right and wrong. Great injustices are thus committed in the name of nominalist man-made, arbitrary, impersonal "law," and this "law" has perennially favored the ruling elites as was already recognized in ancient Greece.

Upinsky points out that the Terror of the French Revolution was imposed in the name of the abstract notion of the rights of "Man in general, who has all the rights, upon particular men, who have no longer any rights. Since 1789, all Terror is nominalist." The much touted declaration on "Rights of Man" proclaimed in its menacing first article that "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Distinctions can only be founded upon public utility." These "rights" are then defined by the total State, whereas men's true right to existence is nothing but the right to be different, "the right to be weak" (p. 480). We see today in legalized abortion of weak, defenseless preborn children and in the imminent legalized killing of the aged - "useless eaters" all in the words of the Nazis about the handicapped - the outworking of nominalist "human rights" based upon public utility over against the true, realist, biblical creation-based right to

life of each and every human being as created in God's own image and likeness.

Upinsky has an interesting list of prominent nominalists and realists in history (p. 210). Among the nominalists he counts Pythagoras, Plato, Euclid, Roscelin, Abelard, Occam, Machiavelli, Galileo, Descartes, Fenelon, Spinoza, Newton, Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Comte, Darwin, Picasso, etc. Among the realists are Homer, Aristotle, Isocrates, Anselm, Bernard de Citeaux, Pascal, Moliere, La Fontaine, Bossuet, Pasteur, Poincare, Bergson, Simone Weil, etc. "These two categories oppose each other back to back: truth vs. formal efficiency; the affective and reason; quality and quantity; logic and intuition; short term and long term; the *a posteriori* and *a priori*; the spirit and the letter; the universal and the uniform; the religious and the intellectual." Disagreement over this or that person on this list is certainly possible; for example, was the devout Christian Fenelon really a nominalist, or emergent evolutionist philosopher Bergson really a realist? With regard to Plato, Upinsky convincingly argues in various passages that his famous seemingly realist "innate ideas" were actually abstractions rather than taken from concrete, true reality in the realist way, and that he was a thoroughgoing nominalist as evident from his notoriously totalitarian *Republic*.

Upinsky, at one time a mathematics professor, is also a supremely competent student of the French language as shown by his fascinating chapter on the revolution of language. Power language, language of inversion, and disinformation developed between the high middle ages and the present. High points of this development are the French Revolution as we would expect, as well as modern art personified by Picasso, and the modern explosion of information technology. Upinsky cites the story told in 1969 by Jacques Maisonrouge, the former chief executive of IBM Europe at the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences: "It is the year 2000. Two immense computers are installed, one in the United States covering all the Americas, the other in Europe covering Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals; finally these two computers are linked by transatlantic cable. The first question to them is: 'Does God exist?' And the answer is: 'Yes, now.'" (pp. 361-362). Information has replaced God.

In the last chapter, "The Beheaded Dream," Upinsky tries to sum up the many profound aspects of his work. Again we have a deeply moving fact in the modern art featured at the bicentennial of the French Revolution, where there was only geometric abstraction but no place for man: "*It is the first time that the man of the West disappears from his art!* Man was present everywhere in the architecture of the Middle Age; he is totally absent from ours." (p. 514) We are reminded of C. S. Lewis's book *The Abolition of Man*, which also begins with the abuse of language (in textbooks of English literature).

Christians may in good conscience disagree with some details of Upinsky's book, such as his latent hostility towards free enterprise capitalism, his assessment of certain historical personalities, and of English as the nominalist international language of our immediate future. No language as such can be nominalist, and as Upinsky

himself says, the basic structure of every language is realist and a variation of the original language God gave to Adam. The book is a veritable encyclopedia of facts the author gleaned from a wide field of human action. In dealing with the war between realism and nominalism, long considered irrelevant among Western thinkers, and in delving into a thousand years of Western history we have largely forgotten or never knew, he widens our horizon and nourishes our inner life. There is abundant food for our thought and further research in the copious footnotes alone. Most important, Upinsky is both innovative and correct in his major theses on the right use of language in the service of truth and created reality, and the abuse of language to alter and transform reality by abstractions and lies spoken in hypocrisy for the sake of worldly power. He also correctly reasons that language precedes and initiates action.

Finally, Upinsky's work confirms the foundation truth opening the Gospel of John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him; and without Him nothing was made that was made. In Him was life, and that life was the light of men." Even though this light "shines in darkness, and the darkness has not understood it," yea, even seeks to extinguish it, He, our Word, Creator, Life and Light is also our Victory and cannot fail. Nominalism, the offshoot and perversion of Realism, cannot prevail against it any more than the branch can separate from and prevail against the Trunk and the Root.

<sup>1</sup>For factual details, see Paul deParrie and Mary Pride, *Unholy Sacrifices of the New Age* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1988).

<sup>2</sup>Charles Colson with Ellen Santilli Vaughn, *The Body: Being Light in the Darkness* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1992), n. p. 173.

<sup>3</sup>C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947, Fourth Printing 1968, p. 85.

<sup>4</sup>Johann Georg Hamann, *Saemtliche Werke (Collected Works)*, Josef Nadler, ed., Volumes I-VI (Vienna, Austria: Herder, 1949-1957), II, pp. 206, 208.

<sup>5</sup>Hamann, *Saemtliche Werke (Collected Works)*, III, p. 288.

Hamann has been shamefully neglected among Christian scholars of philosophy and history. For an introductory but comprehensive study, see Ellen Myers, *Johann Georg Hamann: Interpreter of Reality in Christ*, *Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. XI, No. 2, 1986-87, pp. 134-191; a very brief condensation of this study and quotations from Hamann were published in the *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 3 (Spring 1986). Also read the excellent biography by the dean of Hamann scholars in the USA, James C. O'Flaherty, *Johann Georg Hamann* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, A Division of G. K. Hall & Co., 1979).



## Heavenward

I want to follow you  
and no other god.

Heavenly toward you  
I want to tread.

Troubles on earth  
will be no more,

When you see me  
at heaven's door.

At God's right hand  
I shall see,

You came from heaven  
to call on me.

Mary H. Tenbrink

# Index to Volumes XV and XVI of the CSSH Quarterly

## **VOL. XV, NO. 1 (FALL 1992)**

- Coleson, Edward, *The Messiah in 1492?*  
Dawson, Christopher, *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture*  
(book review)  
Girard, Remi, *The Metastases of Darwinism*  
Liebi, Roger, *Der Sprechender Affe? (Man: A Speaking Ape?)* (book review)  
Medved, Michael, *Popular Culture and the War Against Standards*  
Myers, Ellen, *Satan Against Man: The Fierce War, the Victory in Christ*  
Stalley, Walter G., *Glorify the Lord in Your Trials* (devotional)  
Index to Volumes XIII and XIV of the CSSH Quarterly

## **VOL. XV, NO. 2 (WINTER 1992)**

- Ackerman, Paul D., *Secular Western Mindset or Biblical Framework: The Representative Case of Alfred Adler*  
Berthoud, Jean-Marc, *The Bible and the Nations (Part I)*  
Groothuis, Douglas, *Apologetics, Truth and Humility*  
Jolley, Celia, *Joyful Abandon* (Poetry)  
Jolley, Celia, *Painful Acceptance: The Cost of the Word*  
Jones, Richard L., *Songs in the Night* (Devotional)  
Myers, Ellen, *Rationalistic Solipsism: The Life and Thought of Ayn Rand*

## **VOL. XV, NO. 3 (SPRING 1993)**

- Ackerman, Paul D., *Where Does Time Come From?* (Devotional)  
Berthoud, Jean-Marc, *The Bible and the Nations (Part II)*  
Farris, Michael P., *Where Do I Draw the Line?* (book review)  
Myers, Ellen, *Gardening and Man's Creation in God's Own Image*  
Myers, Ellen, *New Ethics Programs in American Schools*  
Robertson, Pat, *The New World Order* (book review)  
Thaxton, Charles, and Jon Buell, *Why All the Fuss About Creation and Evolution?*

## **VOL. XV, NO. 4 (SUMMER 1993)**

- Bromling, Brad T., *Our Young Earth* (editorial)  
Bromling, Brad T., *Where is the Garden of Eden?*  
Brooke, Tal, *Entering An Era of Anti-Christianity*  
Coleson, Edward, *Galileo: Martyr for Science?*  
Jackson, Wayne, *The Historical Accuracy of the Fall of Jericho*  
Myers, Ellen, *Creation and Proof for the Existence of God*  
Smith, Langdon, *It's Funny, It's Sad, It's Dangerous: A Theistic-Evolutionist Love Poem*  
Tassot, D., *Language-Origins and Evolution*



#### **VOL. XVI, NO. 1 (FALL 1993)**

- Anonymous, *A Letter to Old Friends*  
Bergman, Jerry, *Biological Evolution and Modern Literature*  
Koster, John P., Jr., *The Atheist Syndrome* (book review)  
Myers, Ellen, *Biblical Creation, Aging, and Gerontology*  
Myers, Ellen, *Biblical Creation and Personality*  
Myers, Ellen, *Creation and Nursing Home Care*  
Numbers, Ronald, *The Creationists* (book review)

#### **VOL. XVI, NO. 2 (WINTER 1993)**

- Bruce, Karen, *A Christmas Letter to My Sunday-School Classmates*  
DeParrie, Paul, *Out With the New and In With the Old* (editorial)  
DeParrie, Paul, *Romanced to Death: The Sexual Seduction of American Culture* (book review)  
Domville, Fred, *The Population Crash*  
Jones, E. Michael, *Degenerate Moderns* (book review)  
Major, Trevor J., *Jurassic Park: The New Orthodoxy?*  
Myers, Ellen, *Disobeying God's First Creation Order to Man: "Be Fruitful and Multiply"*  
Schwarz, Fred, *Human Life is Infinitely Valuable* (editorial)  
Sobran, Joseph, *Evolution and Legal Standards*  
Tassot, Dominique, *The Aftereffects of Evolutionism*

#### **VOL. XVI, NO. 3 (SPRING 1994)**

- Ackerman, Paul D., *Christian Principles in Human Affairs* (Message Prepared for Beijing, China Conference in December 1993)  
Martin, Malachi, *The Keys of This Blood* (book review)  
Myers, Ellen, *The Joy of the Lord*  
Myers, Ellen, *The Worldview of Demons*  
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr, *Spiritual Life of Society* (editorial)  
Taylor, Ian, *The Stuff That Dreams Are Made Of*  
Tenbrink, Mary, *Heaven's Voice* (Poetry)  
Tenbrink, Mary, *Waves of Righteousness* (Cover Poetry)

#### **VOL. XVI, NO. 4 (SUMMER 1994)**

- Ackerman, Paul D., Editorial  
Coleson, Edward, *The "Miracle" We Missed*  
Myers, Ellen, *The Breakdown of Philosophy and the Modern Creation-Evolution Debate*  
Myers, Ellen, *Language and Reality: The Work of Arnaud-Aron Upinsky*  
Myers, Ellen, *Plekhanov and Solovyov: A Study of Materialist and Idealist Monism*  
Perera, Eve Lewis, *Wild Turkeys and the Creation Mandate*  
Tenbrink, Mary A., *Heavenward*



---

**EDITORIAL**

The Last Issue of <i>CSSHQ</i> .....	1
--------------------------------------	---

**THE "MIRACLE" WE MISSED**

Edward Coleson .....	2
----------------------	---

**WILD TURKEYS AND THE CREATION MANDATE**

Eve Lewis Perera .....	6
------------------------	---

**PLEKHANOV AND SOLOVYOV: A STUDY OF  
MATERIALIST AND IDEALIST MONISM  
FROM THE BIBLICAL CREATION PERSPECTIVE**

Ellen Myers .....	11
-------------------	----

**THE BREAKDOWN OF PHILOSOPHY AND THE  
MODERN EVOLUTION-CREATION DEBATE**

Ellen Myers .....	17
-------------------	----

**LANGUAGE AND REALITY: THE WORK OF  
ARNAUD-ARON UPINSKY**

Ellen Myers .....	24
-------------------	----

**HEAVENWARD**

Mary A. Tenbrink .....	31
------------------------	----

**INDEX TO VOLUMES XV AND XVI  
OF THE *CSSH QUARTERLY***

.....	32
-------	----

---

Creation Social Science & Humanities Society  
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610  
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Wichita, Kansas Permit No. 1536
---

MO ASSN FOR CREATION  
405 N SAPPINGTON RD  
GLENDALE MO 63122